

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 stand rejected. Claims 1-28 remain pending in this patent application. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the remarks set forth below. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the specification and claims do not add new matter to the application.

Claim Objection

The Examiner has stated that in "Claim 1, the term ' . . . the selecting the . . . '; and Claims 1,3,4,7,12,13,17,23, the word ' . . . possible . . . ' are unclear to what applicant intend to mean." As such, Applicants have herein amended Claims 1 and 7 to provide clearer meaning to their claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants have herein amended Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 12, 13, 17 and 23 to remove the word "possible". Applicants apologize for any inconvenience this may have caused the Examiner.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Duboc et al., US Patent No. 6,587,955 (hereinafter Duboc). Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-28 are not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Duboc.

CLAIM 1

Applicants respectfully contend that Duboc fails to teach or suggest a method of modifying a global electronic resource as recited in newly amended independent Claim 1. For instance, amended Claim 1 recites in part (emphasis added):

selecting the global electronic resource via an input device wherein the global electronic resource is associated with a first electronic design project;
displaying a plurality of parameter values which can be chosen for the global electronic resource in response to said selecting;

Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 recites that in response to the selecting of a global electronic resource, a plurality of parameter values which can be chosen for the global electronic resource are displayed. However, Applicants respectfully assert that Duboc fails to teach or suggest a method that includes these elements as recited within amended Claim 1. Since Duboc fails to teach or suggest at least one element recited in amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully contend that Duboc cannot anticipate nor render obvious amended Claim 1.

Based on the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that newly amended independent Claim 1 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Duboc. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit amended Claim 1 is allowable over Duboc.

CLAIM 7

Applicants respectfully assert that Duboc does not teach or suggest a method of modifying a global electronic resource as recited in newly amended independent Claim 7. For instance, amended Claim 7 recites in part (emphasis added):

selecting a displayed value of the global electronic resource via an input device wherein the global electronic resource is associated with a first circuit design project;

displaying a window comprising a plurality of parameter values which can be selected for the global electronic resource in response to said selecting the displayed value;

Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 7 states that in response to the selecting of a displayed value of a global electronic resource, a window is displayed that comprises a plurality of parameter values which can be selected for the global electronic resource. However, Applicants respectfully contend that Duboc fails to teach or suggest a method that includes these elements as recited within amended Claim 7. Since Duboc fails to teach or suggest at least one element recited in amended Claim 7, Applicants respectfully assert that Duboc cannot anticipate nor render obvious amended Claim 7.

Based on the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that newly amended independent Claim 7 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Duboc. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit amended Claim 7 is allowable over Duboc.

CLAIM 12

Applicants respectfully contend that Duboc does not teach or suggest a system for selecting and using a current global parameter value as recited in newly amended independent Claim 12. For instance, amended Claim 12 recites in part (emphasis added):

a global resource menu configured to display a value of a global electronic resource, to display a plurality of global parameter values which can be chosen for the global electronic resource in response to the value being selected, and to allow one of the plurality of global parameter values to be chosen as the current global parameter value;

Applicants respectfully contend that Duboc fails to teach or suggest a global resource menu that operates as specifically recited in amended Claim 12. For example, Duboc fails to teach or suggest a global resource menu that displays a value of a global electronic resource, and displays a plurality of global parameter values which can be chosen for the global electronic resource in response to the value being selected. Since Duboc fails to teach or suggest at least one element recited in amended Claim 12, Applicants respectfully assert that Duboc cannot anticipate nor render obvious amended Claim 12.

Based on the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that newly amended independent Claim 12 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Duboc. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit amended Claim 12 is allowable over Duboc.

CLAIMS 17 and 23

Applicants respectfully contend that Duboc fails to teach or suggest the methods of processing global electronic design resources as recited in newly amended

independent Claims 17 and 23. For instance, amended Claim 17 recites in part (emphasis added):

displaying, in tabular form, a list of global electronic design resources and respective global design parameter values associated therewith for use in a first electronic design project;

in response to a user selection of a global electronic design resource, displaying a window comprising a plurality of values which can be selected for said global electronic design resource;

Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claims 17 and 23 recite that in response to a user selection of a global electronic design resource, a window is displayed that comprises a plurality of values which can be selected for said global electronic design resource. However, Applicants respectfully assert that Duboc fails to teach or suggest a method that includes these elements as recited within amended Claims 17 and 23. Since Duboc fails to teach or suggest at least one element recited in amended Claims 17 and 23, Applicants respectfully contend that Duboc cannot anticipate nor render obvious amended Claims 17 and 23.

Based on the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that newly amended independent Claims 17 and 23 are not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Duboc. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit amended Claims 17 and 23 are allowable over Duboc.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of rejected Claims 1-28.

Based on the reasoning presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-28 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: FEBRUARY 2, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Thomas Catale', written over a horizontal line.

Thomas M. Catale
Registration No.: 46,434

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

Voice: (408) 938-9060
Facsimile: (408) 938-9069